UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,257	12/04/2003	Hidetoshi Yokota	23690-07983	1195

758 7590 02/23/2010

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
MACILWINEN, JOHN MOORE JAIN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,257	YOKOTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John M. MacIlwinen	2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *1/27/10*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,6,8,10-13,20-25,30,34,35,40,44,45,50 and 54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,6,8,10-13,20-25,30,34,35,40,44,45,50 and 54* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/7/2009, 1/27/2010*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/04/2009 have been fully considered and in view of the claim amendments are persuasive. However, after further consideration, a new grounds of rejection has been made in view of Blanchet (US 2004/0013130 A1). Said grounds of rejection is discussed further below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 35, 40 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Said claims are directed to a “computer readable storage". However, absent a specific disclaimer to the contrary, the broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to “computer readable storage” includes forms of non-statutory subject matter and transitory propagating signals per ser in view of the ordinary and customary meaning.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 10, 11, 12, 25 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blanchet (US 2004/0013130 A1, where IPv6 over IPv4 profile for Tunnel Setup Protocol (TSP) draft-vg-ngtrans-tsp-v6v4profile-00. July 13, 2001. pp. 1 - 13., hereafter v6v4, is incorporated by reference in Blanchet, [28] and where Tunnel Setup Protocol (TSP) draft-vg-ngtrans-tsp-00. June 2001. pp. 1 - 11, hereafter TSP, is incorporated by reference in Blanchet, [28]) in view of Waddington (Realizing the Transition to IPv6) further in view of Stevens (TCP/IP Illustrated, Volume 1: The Protocols).

6. Regarding claim 1, Blanchet shows a method for an IPv6 enabled node comprising:

transmitting a query (Blanchet, [32]) identifying the IPv6 enabled node to a server (v6v4, pg. 4)

receiving, from the server, a list comprising at least one name of an IPv6 connect agent determined by the server based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query (where the identifier may be represented by Blanchet's showing of including the versions of tunneling protocols supported by the client along with the clients IP address; Blanchet, [32-34] and v6v4, pg. 4) the IPv6 connect agent connecting the IPv6 enabled node to a network containing IPv4 components (Blanchet, Figs. 2, 7 and [31, 45]);

the desired IPv6 connect agent being selected from the list ([29, 34] and Fig. 3A item 100);

engaging in IPv6 communication across the network using the address (Blanchet, [29, 45]).

Blanchet does not show all of: where the communication is through a DNS server and transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server.

Waddington shows where the communication is through a DNS server (pg. 139, col. 2).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet with that of Waddington in order to utilize common existing infrastructure, thus easing the difficulties in providing IPv6 migration services (Waddington, pg. 139).

Blanchet in view of Waddington do not explicitly show transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server (pgs. 2, 10-14).

Stevens shows transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server.

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington with that of Stevens in order to comply with traditional DNS querying methodologies and protocols.

7. Regarding claim 10, Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens further show wherein the identifier comprises an Internet Protocol address ([42]).

8. Regarding claim 11, Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens further show wherein the identifier comprises a Media Access Control address (Stevens, pgs. 19 - 22).

9. Regarding claim 12, Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens further show wherein the identifier comprises a character string (Blanchet, [42]).

10. Regarding claim 25, Blanchet shows an IPv6 enabled node comprising:

a software portion that transmits a query (Blanchet, [32]) identifying the IPv6 enabled node to a server (v6v4, pg. 4)

a software portion that receives, from the server, a list comprising at least one name of an IPv6 connect agent determined by the server based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query (where the identifier may be represented by Blanchet's showing of including the versions of tunneling protocols supported by the client along with the clients IP address; Blanchet, [32-34] and v6v4, pg. 4) the IPv6 connect agent connecting the IPv6 enabled node to a network containing IPv4 components (Blanchet, Figs. 2, 7 and [31, 45]);

the desired IPv6 connect agent being selected from the list ([29, 34] and Fig. 3A item 100);

engaging in IPv6 communication across the network using the address (Blanchet, [29, 45]).

Blanchet does not show all of: where the communication is through a DNS server and transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server.

Waddington shows where the communication is through a DNS server (pg. 139, col. 2).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet with that of Waddington in order to utilize common existing infrastructure, thus easing the difficulties in providing IPv6 migration services (Waddington, pg. 139).

Blanchet in view of Waddington do not explicitly show transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server.

Stevens shows transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server (pgs. 2, 10-14).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington with that of Stevens in order to comply with traditional DNS querying methodologies and protocols.

11. Regarding claim 45, Blanchet shows an IPv6 enabled node comprising:

means for transmitting a query (Blanchet, [32]) identifying the IPv6 enabled node to a server (v6v4, pg. 4)

means for receiving, from the server, a list comprising at least one name of an IPv6 connect agent determined by the server based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query (where the identifier may be represented by Blanchet's showing of including the versions of tunneling protocols supported by the client along

with the clients IP address; Blanchet, [32-34] and v6v4, pg. 4) the IPv6 connect agent connecting the IPv6 enabled node to a network containing IPv4 components (Blanchet, Figs. 2, 7 and [31, 45]);

the desired IPv6 connect agent being selected from the list ([29, 34] and Fig. 3A item 100);

engaging in IPv6 communication across the network using the address (Blanchet, [29, 45]).

Blanchet does not show all of: where the communication is through a DNS server and transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server.

Waddington shows where the communication is through a DNS server (pg. 139, col. 2).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet with that of Waddington in order to utilize common existing infrastructure, thus easing the difficulties in providing IPv6 migration services (Waddington, pg. 139).

Blanchet in view of Waddington do not explicitly show transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server.

Stevens shows transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server (pgs. 2, 10-14).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington with that of Stevens in order to comply with traditional DNS querying methodologies and protocols.

12. Claims 6, 13, 20, 22, 23, 24, 30, 34, 35, 40, 44, 50 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC 3053 (IPv6 Tunnel Broker).

13. Regarding claim 6, Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens show claim 1.

Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens do not explicitly show where the desired IPv6 connect agent is one closest to the IPv6 enabled node.

RFC 3053 shows where the desired IPv6 connect agent is one closest to the IPv6 enabled node (Section 2).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens with that of RFC 3053 in order to utilize additional standards developed to ease the transition to IPv6 addressing (RFC 3053, pgs. 1 – 2).

14. Regarding claim 13, Blanchet shows a method for a server comprising:

receiving a query identifying an IPv6 enabled node form the IPv6 enabled node (Blanchet, Figs. 4, 5, [32] and v4v6, pg. 4)

determining at least one IPv6 connect agent based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query, the IPv6 connect agent connecting the IPv6 enabled node to a network containing IPv4 components (Blanchet, Figs. 2, 7 and

[31,45])

transmitting a list comprising at least one name of the IPv6 connect agent determined to the IPv6 enabled node (Blanchet, [29, 31-34])

receiving a name of a desired IPv6 connect agent from the list (Blanchet, [29, 34] and Fig. 3A item 100).

Blanchet does not show all of: where the communication is through a DNS server and after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent to the requestor/IPv6 node.

Waddington shows where the communication is through a DNS server (pg. 139, col. 2).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet with that of Waddington in order to utilize common existing infrastructure, thus easing the difficulties in providing IPv6 migration services (Waddington, pg. 139).

Blanchet in view of Waddington do not explicitly show after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent to the requestor/IPv6 node.

Stevens shows after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent to the requestor/IPv6 node (pgs. 2, 10 - 14).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington with that of

Stevens in order to comply with traditional DNS querying methodologies and protocols.

Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens do not explicitly show where the selecting is by the IPv6 enabled node.

RFC 3053 shows where the selecting is by the IPv6 enabled node (Section 2 and Fig. 1, where said node is represented by RFC 3053's "dual-stack node (user) in Fig. 1").

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens with that of RFC 3053 in order to utilize additional standards developed to ease the transition to IPv6 addressing (RFC 3053, pgs. 1 – 2).

15. Regarding claim 20, Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC 3053 further show searching a record corresponding to the name of the desired IPv6 connect agent from a lookup table; and

finding the address of the desired IPv6 agent from the record (Stevens, pg. 20).

16. Regarding claim 22, Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC 3053 further show wherein the identifier comprises an Internet Protocol Address (Blanchet, [42]).

17. Regarding claim 23, Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC 3053 further show wherein the identifier comprises a Media Access Control address (Stevens, pgs. 19 - 22).

18. Regarding claim 24, Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC 3053 further show wherein the identifier comprises a character string (Blanchet, [42]).

19. Regarding claim 30, Blanchet shows a device comprising:

a software portion that receives a query identifying an IPv6 enabled node form the IPv6 enabled node (Blanchet, Figs. 4, 5, [32] and v4v6, pg. 4)

a software portion that determines at least one IPv6 connect agent based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query, the IPv6 connect agent connecting the IPv6 enabled node to a network containing IPv4 components (Blanchet, Figs. 2, 7 and [31,45])

a software portion that transmits a list comprising at least one name of the IPv6 connect agent determined to the IPv6 enabled node (Blanchet, [29, 31-34])

a software portion that receives a name of a desired IPv6 connect agent from the list (Blanchet, [29, 34] and Fig. 3A item 100).

Blanchet does not show all of: where the communication is through a DNS server and after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent to the requestor/IPv6 node.

Waddington shows where the communication is through a DNS server (pg. 139, col. 2).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet with that of Waddington in order to utilize common existing infrastructure, thus easing the difficulties in providing IPv6 migration services (Waddington, pg. 139).

Blanchet in view of Waddington do not explicitly show after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent

to the requestor/IPv6 node.

Stevens shows after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent to the requestor/IPv6 node (pgs. 2, 10 - 14).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington with that of Stevens in order to comply with traditional DNS querying methodologies and protocols.

Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens do not explicitly show where the selecting is by the IPv6 enabled node.

RFC 3053 shows where the selecting is by the IPv6 enabled node (Section 2 and Fig. 1, where said node is represented by RFC 3053's "dual-stack node (user) in Fig. 1").

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens with that of RFC 3053 in order to utilize additional standards developed to ease the transition to IPv6 addressing (RFC 3053, pgs. 1 – 2).

20. Regarding claim 34, Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC 3053 further show a software portion that searches a record corresponding to the name of the desired IPv6 connect agent from a lookup table; and

a software portion that finds the address of the desired IPv6 agent from the record (Stevens, pg. 20).

21. Regarding claim 35, Blanchet shows a computer readable storage containing a program for an IPv6 enabled node, the programming making a computer execute:

transmitting a query (Blanchet, [32]) identifying the IPv6 enabled node to a server (v6v4, pg. 4)

receiving from the server, a list comprising at least one name of an IPv6 connect agent determined by the server based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query (where the identifier may be represented by Blanchet's showing of including the versions of tunneling protocols supported by the client along with the clients IP address; Blanchet, [32-34] and v6v4, pg. 4) the IPv6 connect agent connecting the IPv6 enabled node to a network containing IPv4 components (Blanchet, Figs. 2, 7 and [31, 45]);

the desired IPv6 connect agent being selected from the list ([29, 34] and Fig. 3A item 100);

engaging in IPv6 communication across the network using the address (Blanchet, [29, 45]).

Blanchet does not show all of: where the communication is through a DNS server and transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server.

Waddington shows where the communication is through a DNS server (pg. 139, col. 2).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet with that of Waddington in order to utilize

common existing infrastructure, thus easing the difficulties in providing IPv6 migration services (Waddington, pg. 139).

Blanchet in view of Waddington do not explicitly show transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server.

Stevens shows transmitting the name of a desired server/agent to the DNS server and receiving an address of said server/agent from the DNS server (pgs. 2, 10-14).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington with that of Stevens in order to comply with traditional DNS querying methodologies and protocols.

Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens do not explicitly show where the selecting is by the IPv6 enabled node.

RFC 3053 shows where the selecting is by the IPv6 enabled node (Section 2 and Fig. 1, where said node is represented by RFC 3053's "dual-stack node (user) in Fig. 1").

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens with that of RFC 3053 in order to utilize additional standards developed to ease the transition to IPv6 addressing (RFC 3053, pgs. 1 – 2).

22. Regarding claim 40, Blanchet shows a computer readable storage containing a program for a server, the computer program making a computer execute:

receiving a query identifying an IPv6 enabled node form the IPv6 enabled node (Blanchet, Figs. 4, 5, [32] and v4v6, pg. 4)

determining at least one IPv6 connect agent based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query, the IPv6 connect agent connecting the IPv6 enabled node to a network containing IPv4 components (Blanchet, Figs. 2, 7 and [31,45])

transmitting a list comprising at least one name of the IPv6 connect agent determined to the IPv6 enabled node (Blanchet, [29, 31-34])

receiving a name of a desired IPv6 connect agent from the list (Blanchet, [29, 34] and Fig. 3A item 100).

Blanchet does not show all of: where the communication is through a DNS server and after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent to the requestor/IPv6 node.

Waddington shows where the communication is through a DNS server (pg. 139, col. 2).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet with that of Waddington in order to utilize common existing infrastructure, thus easing the difficulties in providing IPv6 migration services (Waddington, pg. 139).

Blanchet in view of Waddington do not explicitly show after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent to the requestor/IPv6 node.

Stevens shows after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent to the requestor/IPv6 node (pgs. 2, 10 - 14).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington with that of Stevens in order to comply with traditional DNS querying methodologies and protocols.

Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens do not explicitly show where the selecting is by the IPv6 enabled node.

RFC 3053 shows where the selecting is by the IPv6 enabled node (Section 2 and Fig. 1, where said node is represented by RFC 3053's "dual-stack node (user) in Fig. 1").

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens with that of RFC 3053 in order to utilize additional standards developed to ease the transition to IPv6 addressing (RFC 3053, pgs. 1 – 2).

23. Regarding claim 44, Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC 3053 further show searching a record corresponding to the name of the desired IPv6 connect agent from a lookup table; and

finding the address of the desired IPv6 agent from the record (Stevens, pg. 20).

24. Regarding claim 50, Blanchet shows a service device comprising:

means for receiving a query identifying an IPv6 enabled node form the IPv6 enabled node (Blanchet, Figs. 4, 5, [32] and v4v6, pg. 4)

means for determining at least one IPv6 connect agent based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query, the IPv6 connect agent connecting the IPv6 enabled node to a network containing IPv4 components (Blanchet, Figs. 2, 7 and [31,45])

means for transmitting a list comprising at least one name of the IPv6 connect agent determined to the IPv6 enabled node (Blanchet, [29, 31-34])

means for receiving a name of a desired IPv6 connect agent from the list (Blanchet, [29, 34] and Fig. 3A item 100).

Blanchet does not show all of: where the communication is through a DNS server and after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent to the requestor/IPv6 node.

Waddington shows where the communication is through a DNS server (pg. 139, col. 2).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet with that of Waddington in order to utilize common existing infrastructure, thus easing the difficulties in providing IPv6 migration services (Waddington, pg. 139).

Blanchet in view of Waddington do not explicitly show after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent to the requestor/IPv6 node.

Stevens shows after receiving a name of said server/agent, said DNS server transmitting the address of the desired server/agent to the requestor/IPv6 node (pgs. 2,

10 - 14).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington with that of Stevens in order to comply with traditional DNS querying methodologies and protocols.

Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens do not explicitly show where the selecting is by the IPv6 enabled node.

RFC 3053 shows where the selecting is by the IPv6 enabled node (Section 2 and Fig. 1, where said node is represented by RFC 3053's "dual-stack node (user) in Fig. 1").

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington and Stevens with that of RFC 3053 in order to utilize additional standards developed to ease the transition to IPv6 addressing (RFC 3053, pgs. 1 – 2).

25. Regarding claim 50, Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC 3053 further show means for searching a record corresponding to the name of the desired IPv6 connect agent from a lookup table; and

means for finding the address of the desired IPv6 agent from the record (Stevens, pg. 20).

26. Claims 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Coughlin (US 6,810,411 B1).

27. Regarding claim 8, Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens show claim 1.

Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens do not show where the desired IPv6 connect agent is the one whose name is first received from the DNS server.

Coughlin shows where the desired IPv6 connect agent is the one whose name is first received from the DNS server (Coughlin, col. 10 lines 45 – 67).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens with that of Coughlin in order to ensure a DNS server was selected, and when possible, the fastest available (i.e., the first to respond) server is selected.

28. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC 3053 as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Kang et al. (US 2003/0074461 A1).

29. Regarding claim 21, Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC 3053 show claim 20.

Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC 3053 do not explicitly show using a Naming Authority Pointer Domain Name System resource record.

Kang shows using a Naming Authority Pointer Domain Name System resource record ([8, 22, 31 – 34]).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Blanchet in view of Waddington, Stevens and RFC

3053 with that of Kang in order to use an additional record, compatible with the DNS methodology of the other disclosures, to resolve and lookup hosts (Kang, [8]).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. MacIlwinen whose telephone number is (571) 272-9686. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 5:00PM EST; off alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joon Hwang, can be reached on (571) 272 - 4036. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John MacIlwinen

(571) 272 - 9686

/Joon H. Hwang/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2447